2:Richards E-5 (1930-1934)1939
FQS Bemba FQS

supernatural punishment, but a series of broken obligations such as really to offend a chief are viewed with apprehension by young men as well as old.

Besides this it was the positive aim of every Bemba to win the good will of his chief as we have seen, and the headman who willingly brought workers for the *mfumu* was sure of favours sooner or later. It is possible to watch a headman courting the chief in this way even to-day, and he himself uses any privileges he has had confirmed under the Native Courts Ordinance, such as the right to give a man permission to build a village, to reward any subject who tries to please him.

The tribute labourers got food and beer during the visit and they worked under pleasant conditions in large gangs of friends. Even during my visit I never heard complaints of *amalasa* where the chiefs had means of feeding their workers, and the visit to the capital is considered an opportunity to meet relatives and celebrities, to put grievances before the chief, or to transact any other business. The people still definitely prefer their ruler to have a big granary. It gives them, I think, a sense of security—a feeling of certainty that there will be food at the capital and a knowledge that they are working for a powerful and successful man (cf. p. 214). Besides this, a hungry man has technically the right to call upon his chief for help. I did not hear of this claim being made very often, but still, in a sense, the *amalasa* garden and *amalasa* granary are recognized as belonging to the people. A man can steal from the tribute garden of a chief, but not from those of his wives, and I have sometimes heard old natives speak with pride of 'our' granary, adding, 'It was we who filled it to overflowing'. Thus the commoner got by his labour the sense of supernatural support, a personal approach to his chief, food in return for his work, support in time of starvation, and, as we shall see, leadership in economic pursuits. The chief in return got extra supplies of food to distribute, the means of supporting his tribal council, the necessary labour for tribal undertakings such as road-building, and last, but not least, prestige (cf. Chap. XII).

In brief the extravagant claims of the Bemba king to own all his land and everything that grows or lives in it, only gave him the right to exact small regular dues on the labour and produce of his people, and to call on them for further help in times of emergency. These levies exist, but are very much reduced to-day. They

2:Richards E-5 (1930-1934)1939
FQ5 Bemba FQ5

643 622 651 [647]

so call it, melt away. Besides this, his prestige will gradually go when he is no longer able to carry out his obligations on the same scale as before. The situation has in fact reached a kind of impasse at the moment. Because the *mfumu* gets less labour, he makes smaller gardens and has less food to feed his workers, so that they in their turn are less willing to serve him another year. From figures I collected during my visit it was clear that in some capitals the labourers were getting no food at all in return for their work. The late Nkula employed a hunter, and had a reputation for giving his people meat. Consequently he always seemed able to get work done for him. Sub-chief Lucembe was a hunter himself and lived in good game country. He was therefore in a fortunate position. But Citimukulu sometimes sent men away without food, or gave them one meal in two days, while the women were supposed to bring their own supplies and cook for themselves. Mukuikile, a sub-chief in the Mpika district, fed the men, but not the women. It is clear from these instances that the modern chief is no longer able to carry out his obligations to his people. Those who grumble at the chief's lack of hospitality have reason on their side, but to refuse to do their service as a protest increases the difficulty.

622 571 657 643

As a second result, many chiefs now fail to keep their panel of advisers and councillors at court to transact the necessary tribal business. I have seen the Citimukulu hear cases alone with his clerk, and during 1934 the *bakabilo* summoned by him on important matters of business invariably melted away before the end of the meeting because they had not enough food. It took a period of three months of alternately summoning the council and then dismissing it because of shortage, before the work could be carried through.

622 644 643

Chiefs are also beginning perforce to refuse food to the hungry, and even to their poor relations. In January 1934 Citimukulu gave up the distinction between his *amalasa* granary and his personal one, and fed his wife and family on anything he could lay hands on. The right to take food from the royal mounds (*mputa*) already limited to near relatives, was still further curtailed. In July 1933 I heard the guardian of the Paramount's granary walk round the village at night shouting, 'Listen everyone! Hunger has fallen! No one is to dig up cassava from the chief's *mputa*. If he is hungry let him come to the chief and make obeisance and he will be given something.' It is true that this failure of commissariat occurred during a year when the locusts had done their maximum damage and in

622 657 643

2:Richards E-5 (1930-1934)1939
FQ5 Bemba FQ5

622 the case of a chief who was plainly a poor organizer, but the art of chieftainship is difficult to practise even in the most advantageous •657 conditions at the present time. A servant of the late Nkula, who 643 was a chief of far greater ability than the Paramount, told me ruefully that his master no longer fed all the inhabitants of the capital as he used to. 'He just sends me round the village to sit with the elders of each division (*icitente*). If I hear so much grumbling that I am afraid they will begin to leave the capital, I tell the chief and he sends them what food he has.'

Such failures of the chief to provide for his subjects, little though he may be accountable for them, insensibly weaken his prestige at a time when the Government is most anxious to build on that attribute. The tradition of the generous king survives as a standard against which the modern ruler is constantly measured, and measured to his disadvantage. Despite all evidence to the contrary, the Bemba commoners continue to believe that their chiefs could give them more if they only tried. They make such remarks as, 'These are not chiefs at all! Look how much Citimukulu Ponde or Citapankwa gave our forefathers', and these memories actually determine the prestige given to a chief at the present day.

643 If it be asked whether the Bemba chiefs could not substitute 465 money payments for *amalasa* dues, the answer is simply that their salaries are not large enough. The Paramount gets £60 a year, of which in 1934 he spent £22. 12*s.* on clothing his wives and family, £15. 10*s.* on paying and clothing his messengers, personal servants, and band, and £2. 10*s.* on cloth for the ancestral shrines, thus leaving for personal needs, demands from relatives, ammunition, &c. the sum of £18. 10*s.* 6*d.* or only 30*s.* a month.[1]

622 The other big chiefs have even smaller salaries, e.g. Mwamba 465 £50, Nkula £40, and some of the sub-chiefs as little as £10 a year. Added to this fundamental difficulty, the Bemba chiefs do not consider their salaries as funds to be used for the benefit of the tribe. They are something new, a sort of unexpected windfall given as a sign of the Government's favour. They are not yet part of the warp and woof of tribal organization. The food he gets, the chief distributes, the money he does not.[2] Nor does it seem that the newly instituted tribal treasuries perform any of the functions

[1] Cf. my 'Tribal Government in transition', *Journal of the African Society*, vol. xxxiv, no. cxxxvii, 1935, for a discussion on this whole question.

[2] To a body of discontented councillors Citimukulu explained, 'If I had any elephant tusks, you know I should give them to you.'

2:Richards E-5 (1930-1934)1939
FQ5 Bemba FQ5

without adequate provision for the running of the political machine, naturally reduces the efficiency of the chief and his council to a dangerous extent, and even with such a provision, the abolition of all voluntary service for the tribe brings one of the most educational influences to which Bemba youth is subject, to an end.

To conclude, Bemba rights to the use of land are part of a reciprocal series of obligations between subject and chief. The former accepts the political status of subject and membership of a village group. He gives respect, labour, and tribute to his chief, and in return he is able to cultivate as much land as he pleases and to occupy it for as long as he needs. The latter prays to the tribal spirits in order to make the land productive, initiates economic effort, feeds the hungry, and maintains his court and tribal councillors—all that the Bemba mean by saying that he is 'working' his land. The political machinery founded on this system of land-tenure is breaking down with changing religious beliefs and the chief's diminishing power to exact his legal dues. But from the agricultural point of view the position of the commoner remains secure, and no Bemba chief has yet profited from changing conditions to limit his subjects' right of cultivation or has tried to exact a profit from his theoretical ownership of land.

Rights of Selection and Occupation.

I have discussed rather fully the rights of the Bemba to occupy land as these are traditionally defined between subject and chief. What is the situation as between one commoner and another? As far as the chief is concerned a man may clear the bush anywhere in the *icalo*, if he accepts the status of a subject and membership of a village community. This fact was made clear to me when listening to a case brought before Citimukulu's court. On this occasion the headman of village A on one side of a river complained that villagers from B on the opposite bank had crossed the stream and cut gardens in the bush immediately near his village instead of cultivating on the other side. Citimukulu heard the case at some length, but gave his decision without hesitation. He declared that no action lay, and dismissed all the litigants. He said to the assembled court, 'They are all my people. It is my *icalo* and

African squatter native cannot leave a farm without permission from his owner, and in some districts the native who breaks his contract with his landlord is convicted under a penal code.